



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

if approving it, make it "binding upon all in the industry and do it by law, instead of by force, after full opportunity for hearing to the minority" (p. 226). This would be "in the nature of legislation fixing conditions of labor and . . . the same as the action of minimum wage boards" (p. 227).

This is not submitted "as a final plan," but "we must invent new ways. If we have not yet found the right ones we must try until we do find them" (p. 228). The plan is put forth as necessarily forced upon us by "industrial democracy." Industrial democracy we must have. If we cannot adopt this plan or something similar, "let us," says Cohen quite correctly, "frankly admit that we are, in truth, unprepared for the new order of industry" (p. 238).

JOHN R. COMMONS

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

---

*English Field Systems.* By HOWARD L. GRAY. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1915. 8vo, pp. 568. \$2.75.

That a close study of the agricultural practices of English villages would probably disclose many new facts with regard to the extension of the two- and three-field system in the Middle Ages, and also many deviations from the field arrangements usually considered normal, has for long been evident to students of manorial documents. It has also been evident that such a study would be attended by difficulties and dangers on account of the paucity of the early evidence, the necessity of arguing from known later conditions to earlier, generally unknown conditions, and the great labor involved in collecting a sufficient number of instances of the forms of village fields to serve as a safe basis for generalization. In that part of *English Field Systems* in which he deals with the familiar two- and three-field system, Dr. Gray has made a valuable contribution to our knowledge of the history of English agriculture. He has used as evidence mainly manorial surveys and field books of the Tudor and Stuart periods, supplementing the information so gained with facts drawn from terriers of the fifteenth to seventeenth centuries, inclosure awards, tithe maps, and the like, and working back therefrom to the earlier, less complete evidence of charters, feet of fines, and manorial surveys. The amount of manuscript material examined and cited is very great, and the information regarding the geographical extension of the two- and three-field system, although rather late in date,

is probably more exact than could reasonably have been expected. Dr. Gray traces the system in the north and south midlands, in general in the district extending from Durham to the channel, and from the Welsh marches to the fens. Deviations within the region, of which he finds many, he ascribes to natural conditions such as forest areas and rich river valleys. He gives some evidence also of the passage in the thirteenth century from the two-field to the three-field system, from a more primitive to a more advanced method of cultivation. Whether, however, from the evidence he adduces he is justified in concluding that "it is not improbable" that the three-field was always a derived system, seems questionable. His explanation of the slowness of inclosures in the midlands as due to the prevalence of the open-field system there is also of interest.

In the latter part of his book Dr. Gray turns to other parts of England, where he believes the midland system to have been non-existent or imposed upon an earlier, different system. After a preliminary and very superficial sketch of field arrangements in Scotland, Ireland, and Wales, in which, for example, little allowance is made for the predominance of pasture over agriculture in some districts, he attempts to prove that the arrangements in certain parts of England where he believes the two- and three-field system did not exist were in the main due to Celtic influence. His argument is briefly as follows. He finds four characteristics of the so-called Celtic system: first, the presence of small hamlets, a characteristic familiar enough to readers of Meitzen, but surely not so unquestioningly to be accepted as Dr. Gray seems to imply; second, the existence of customs of runrig, the division of intermixed parcels of land among tenants, which he suggests was derived from the partibility of land among heirs; third, the practice of rotation of crops by which either a succession of spring crops was followed by several years of fallow, or else there was unbroken succession of spring crops on land manured every third year; fourth, and most important of all in his argument, the negative characteristic that in a given district there is no evidence of a two- or three-field system. The presence of any of these characteristics is sufficient to create a presumption in favor of Celtic influence, but it is the fourth and negative characteristic that is most stressed. It will never be possible, he says, to state of an English county, "'Here is clearly the field system of Scotland or Wales or Ireland.' We shall rather have to conclude: 'Its fields lack the positive attributes of English midland fields, just as the fields of Celtic lands do. In their negative characteristics they are Celtic.'" Proceeding on this

assumption, he finds Celtic influence strong in Northumberland, Cumberland, Lancashire, Cheshire, and the extreme southwest. Southeastern England shows still another racial influence. The Kentish system he believes to have been one of compact rectangular *juga* surviving from the days of the Roman occupation; the east Anglian, with regard to which he is far from convincing, one of *tenementa*, probably originally compact areas, derived from the Roman *juga* but influenced in some way by the Danish Conquest. The splitting up of compact tenements he explains by inheritance by co-heirs, gavelkind in this connection perhaps not antedating the Norman Conquest. Like peculiarities he believes would put the lower Thames basin within the sphere of Roman influence.

Dr. Gray's argument for racial influence as determining field systems seems to rest on too many hypotheses to be conclusive. The fact that the two- and three-field system did not exist in a given district, if it can be always clearly proved that it did not exist, does not necessarily imply Celtic influence, nor is the evidence for Roman survivals satisfactory. Natural conditions, waste, fen inaccessibility, must have had much to do with agricultural development, as Dr. Gray himself admits in explaining deviations from the midland system in the region ascribed to it. Not all such differences need be referred to racial settlement. It is probable that much more local investigation of village arrangements and a far closer study of customs of inheritance in relation to land must be made before conclusions covering so very wide a field can be reached safely. Dr. Gray's book remains, however, a very interesting study of open-field arrangements, especially in the time of enclosures, and an admirable collection of material, drawn from various centuries, relating to the history of agriculture.

N. NEILSON

MOUNT HOLYOKE COLLEGE

---

*The Boycott in American Trade Unions.* By LEO WOLMAN. Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science, Series XXXIV, No. 1. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1916. 8vo, pp. 148. \$1.00.

For thirty-five years the boycott has been one of the chief weapons employed by organized labor. Yet not until Laidler's *Boycotts and the Labor Struggle* was published in 1914 was there any American book comprehensively discussing the boycott. Now we have a second book upon this subject, based principally upon the publications of labor unions and employers' associations.